

To: "Mike Jewell" [Michael.S.Jewell@usace.army.mil]; Michael G SPK Nepstad"
[Michael.G.Nepstad@usace.army.mil]
Cc: CN=Erin Foresman/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US@EPA[]
From: CN=Karen Schwinn/OU=R9/O=USEPA/C=US
Sent: Wed 6/15/2011 8:04:53 PM
Subject: BDCP

Mike and Mike -

By now, you've heard that the issue of P&N (and alternatives) is getting more high level attention within federal agency group. I'm not sure where you guys are on this issue....I have a thought on how EPA could be satisfied and I'm wondering if this does anything for you: I suggest we resolve the issue within the MOU itself (rather than as a step after the MOU) by incorporating the interpretative language from DOI/NOAA's letter to us last fall (basically saying contracts weren't the metric). We then get DWR's agreement on this when they sign the MOU. My biggest problem with the October Lead Agency response is that they didn't have DWR (or contractor) agreement. This way, we get at least DWR to agree to it if they want to sign MOU. What do you think? - KS (Today I'm at (b) (6) if you want to discuss.)